Appl. No. 10/710,927 Amdt. dated September 14, 2007 Reply to Office action of July 12, 2007

# **Amendments to the Drawings:**

Figure 1 has been amended to add the legend of "Prior art", and no other changes have been made. Acceptance of the corrected drawings is respectfully requested.

Attachment:

Replacement Sheet

1 page

5

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

## 1. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to be cause of the usage of legal phraseology within the abstract. Appropriate correction is required.

5

#### Response:

The abstract has been amended to remove the legal phraseology and to make the abstract narrative in form. Acceptance of the corrected abstract is respectfully requested.

10

#### 2. Objection to claim 1:

Claim 1 is objected to due to a grammatical error. The phrase "a computing device with an security device" should be "a computing device with a security device". Appropriate correction is required.

15

## Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to correct this informality. Acceptance of the corrected claim 1 is respectfully requested.

20 3. Rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mooney et al. (US 5,610,981).

### Response:

25

Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish from Mooney. The applicant would like to explain how the currently amended claim 1 and the original claim 19 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Appl. No. 10/710,927 Amdt. dated September 14, 2007 Reply to Office action of July 12, 2007

5

10

15

20

25

Claim 1 recites that first identification information is stored in a computing device and second identification information is stored in a security device. The first identification information comprises both primary first identification information and secondary first identification information. The primary first identification information is analogous to an administrator security code, and the secondary first identification information is analogous to a security code for other authorized users.

The method of claim 1 compares the primary first identification information with the second identification information. In response to the second identification information matching the primary first identification information, a query is made to ask the user whether he would like to update the identification information. In addition, the method also compares the secondary first identification information with the second identification information. In response to the second identification information matching the secondary first identification information, the method skips querying the user whether he wants to update the first identification information, and the method executes the operation system program directly.

Claim 19 contains similar limitations, and the claimed computing system comprises an administrator security device having primary second identification information and a user security device having secondary second identification information. When the primary second identification information matches the primary first identification information, a query is made to ask the user whether he wants to update the first identification information.

On the other hand, Mooney does not teach the use of a first access card granting administrator-level security clearance and a second access card granting security clearance to other authorized users. Furthermore, Mooney does not teach first

Appl. No. 10/710,927

Amdt. dated September 14, 2007

Reply to Office action of July 12, 2007

identification information residing on a computer and comprising both primary first identification information and secondary first identification information. As a result, Mooney does not teach a way to distinguish between administrator users and regular users based on the identification information residing in their access card.

5

For these reasons, the applicant submits that Mooney fails to teach all of the limitations recited in the currently amended claim 1 and in claim 19. Claims 2, 3, and 20-23 are dependent on claims 1 and 19, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-3 and 19-23 is therefore respectfully requested.

10

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15 Sincerely yours,

Weintontan	Date:	09.14.2007
	<del> </del>	

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

20 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.

25 is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)